UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,634	09/15/2003	Ryoji Matsumura	117163	7951

25944   7590   09/19/2007
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
MCCOMMAS, BRENDAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2609	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09/15/2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09/15/2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   **Claims 1-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wiley

et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 10,003,818), hereinafter referenced as Wiley.

3.   **Regarding claim 1**, Wiley discloses a method for providing a remote document

history repository and multifunction device thereof. The combination of said history

repository and said multifunction device reads on claimed, *"cooperative processing*

apparatus."

4.   In addition, Wiley discloses a multi-function device which sends the electronic

image of the paper document to an email account, a facsimile machine, a copier or

other various network destinations based on user input and reads on claimed, *"a service*

execution requesting unit which requests a service processing apparatus based on first

cooperation instruction information" as disclosed in paragraphs 20-23.

5.   In addition Wiley discloses, in paragraphs 51-56, that the multifunction device

can redirect a document copy when there is a send failure to a number of network

destinations and that information related to the data, such as location, and redirection

information is stored in a remote document history repository and reads on claimed,

"cooperation instruction information generating unit for generating second cooperation

instruction information that instructs cooperative execution of the service which the service processing apparatus has become incapable of executing."

6.   **Regarding claim 2,** Wiley discloses, in paragraph 51, everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Wiley discloses that the multi-function device automatically redirects the document when there is a send failure, for instance the destination is busy or jammed. Further Wiley discloses in paragraphs 49-51 program code may be provided to redirect a document automatically, and reads on claimed, *"cooperation instruction information generating unit generates the second cooperation instruction information when the service processing apparatus has become incapable of executing the service."*

7.   **Regarding claim 3**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 2), in addition Wiley discloses in paragraph 51 that the multi-function device can receive the error message from a destination, such as a printer or email server, and then redirect the document copy to another location, such as a server or another destination chosen by the user. Wiley also discloses in paragraphs 24, 30-31 and 51 that the document sent away generates document delivery data, and when an error occurs this data is available over the LAN for the multi-function device to either show to the user or automatically copy to a new delivery request to a new destination, and reads on claimed, *"cooperative processing apparatus, which incorporates the same identification information from the first failed cooperation instruction in the second cooperation instruction and deletes the execution-completed services and writes a statement that remaining services should be executed in a cooperative manner. "*

8.   **Regarding claim 4**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see

claim 3), in addition Wiley discloses, in paragraphs 41-44 and 55, that once the

document is sent from the multifunction device, delivery data is generated and recorded

in a remote document history repository which can be accessed at a network site and

tells which multifunction device the document comes from, and other important

information regarding the document, such as a future destination or percentage

completed, and reads on claimed, "*cooperation instruction information unit which*

generates storage destination information of document data before the service

processing apparatus became incapable of servicing the request."

9.   **Regarding claim 5**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see

claim 4), in addition Wiley discloses, in paragraph 46, that multifunction device

generates the document identification details, which may include the recipient, the user,

and other important information including the number of pages sent, any failures or

errors, etc, and reads on claimed "*cooperation instruction generating unit which*

generates second cooperation instruction information including log information

indicating execution completed services, or second cooperation instruction information

to which the first cooperation instruction information is attached. "

10.   **Regarding claim 6**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see

claim 5), in addition Wiley discloses, in paragraph 51 that the multifunction device can

automatically redirect a failed document to a new location on the network, based on an

automatic selection, and reads on claimed "*service execution unit which requests on*

basis of second cooperation instruction information a service processing apparatus for

executing a service. "

11.   **Regarding claim 7**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see

claim 6), in addition Wiley discloses, in paragraph 51 that the multifunction device can

automatically free itself up, for example by taking an action of resending a document,

which reads on cooperative process suspending unit. Further Wiley discloses in

paragraph 51 that the administrator may configure the multi-function device to limit the

destination devices, and choose which one to use in the case of a specified

circumstance, such as an error or confidentiality, which reads on claimed search unit for

searching for a substitute processing apparatus. Further Wiley discloses, in paragraph

51, that the multifunction device contains code, which automatically redirects the

document copy in the case of an error, and *"reads on claimed control unit for switching*

controlling the cooperation instruction information generating unit, the cooperative

process suspending unit and the search unit."

12.   **Regarding claim 8**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see

claim 7), in addition claim 8 is interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth

above in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 8 describes the method and claim 1 describes

an apparatus for implementing a method. Thus claim 8 is rejected.

13.   **Regarding claim 9**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see

claim 7) in addition claim 9 is interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth

above in the rejection of claim 2. Claim 9 describes the method and claim 2 describes

an apparatus for implementing a method. Thus claim 9 is rejected.

14.   **Regarding claim 10**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7), in addition claim 10 is interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 3. Claim 10 describes the method and claim 3describes an apparatus for implementing a method. Thus claim 10 is rejected.

15.   **Regarding claim 11**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7), in addition claim 11 is interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 4. Claim 11 describes the method and claim 4 describes an apparatus for implementing a method. Thus claim 11 is rejected.

16.   **Regarding claim 12**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7), in addition claim 12 is interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 4. Claim 12 describes the method and claim 3describes an apparatus for implementing a method. Thus claim 12 is rejected.

17.   **Regarding claim 13**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7), in addition claim 13 is interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 5. Claim 13 describes the method and claim 5 describes an apparatus for implementing a method. Thus claim 13 is rejected.

18.   **Regarding claim 14**, Wiley discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 7), in addition claim 14 is interpreted and thus rejected for the reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 7. Claim 14 describes the method and claim 7 describes an apparatus for implementing a method. Thus claim 14 is rejected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Brendan N. McCommas whose telephone number is

571-270-3575. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (alternate F off) 7:30 am

-5 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jefferey Harold can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brendan N McCommas
Examiner
Art Unit 2609

BNM
BNM
August 29, 2007

JEFFEREY F. HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER